1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. YOUNG: Good afternoon, your Honor. Brian Young,
Department of Justice fraud section, for the United States,
together with Carol Sipperly from the fraud section, Michael
Koenig from the antitrust section, and FBI Agent Jeffrey Weeks.

MR. WEDDLE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Justin Weddle, with the firm Brown Rudnick, for the defendant Paul Robson, who is sitting next to me. My colleague Laura Jensen is also sitting next to me.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. My understanding is that the defendant wishes to enter a plea of guilty to Count One of indictment 14 Cr. 272. Is that correct?

MR. WEDDLE: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: We will place the defendant under oath.

(Defendant sworn)

THE CLERK: Please state your name.

THE DEFENDANT: Paul Robson.

THE CLERK: Please spell your last name slowly.

THE DEFENDANT: R-O-B-S-O-N.

THE CLERK: Please be seated.

THE COURT: Mr. Robson, let me first advise you that because you are under oath, anything that you say that is knowingly false could subject you to punishment for perjury or obstruction of justice or the making of false statements. Do you understand?

THE COURT: Have you told him everything you know

24

25

about this matter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: You are named in indictment 14 Cr. 272, which charges you both with conspiracy and wire fraud and aiding and abetting. You have read that indictment, yes?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have gone over it with your counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have a right to go to trial on that indictment, but I understand you wish to plead guilty instead, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before I can accept any plea of guilty, I need to make certain, among other things, that you understand the rights that you will be giving up if you plead guilty. I want to go over with you now the rights that you will be giving up. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: First, you have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Second, if there were a trial, you would be presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be convicted of any charge. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: Third, at the trial you would have the right to be represented by counsel. Once again, if at any time you could not afford counsel, the Court would appoint one to represent you free of charge throughout the trial and all other proceedings. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Fourth, at the trial you would have the right to see and hear all the witnesses and other evidence against you, and your attorney could cross-examine the government's witnesses and object to the government's evidence, and could present evidence on your own behalf if you so desired, and could have subpoenas issued to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence on your own behalf. Do you understand all that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Fifth, at a trial you would have the right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you the testify if you did not want to. No suggestion of guilt could be drawn against you simply because you chose not to testify.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Finally, even if you were convicted of one or more counts, you would have the right to appeal your conviction, do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: Mr. Robson, do you understand that if you plead guilty, you will be giving up each and every one of the rights we just discussed. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The charge in Count One is a conspiracy to commit wire fraud and bank fraud. It carries a maximum sentence of 30 years' imprisonment plus up to 5 years' supervised release and a maximum fine of \$1 million. Do you understand those are the maximum penalties you would pay if you plead guilty to Count One?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Also, do you understand that if I were to impose a term of supervised release to follow any imprisonment and you were to violate any of the conditions of supervised release, that could subject you to still further imprisonment, going even beyond the term of supervised release? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: At this point in time I have absolutely no idea what sentence I will impose if I accept your plea of guilty, but I have been furnished with a letter agreement that we will now mark the original of as Court Exhibit 1. It takes the form of a letter dated August 5, 2014, from the government to your counsel, and it appears, Mr. Robson, that you signed it

1 | earlier today. Is that correct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before signing it, did you read it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Did you understand its terms?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you sign it in order to indicate your agreement with its terms?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.

THE COURT: This letter agreement that we have now marked as Court Exhibit 1 is binding between you and the government, but it is not binding on me. It is not binding on the Court. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: For example, this letter agreement says that if you cooperate with the government and render in their view substantial assistance, they will make a motion to me to have your sentence reduced. Do you understand that is their promise to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If they make that motion, I may grant it or I may deny it. And even if I grant it, I may reduce your sentence or I may not reduce your sentence. Regardless of

where I come out, if you plead guilty, you will still be bound by my sentence. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: More generally, do you understand that if anyone has made any kind of promises or predictions or estimates or representations to you of what your sentence will be in this case, that person could be wrong; nevertheless, if you plead guilty you will be bound by my sentence. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government represent that this letter agreement that we have now marked as Court Exhibit 1 is the entirety of any and all agreements between the United States and Mr. Robson?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, we do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does defense counsel confirm that as correct?

MR. WEDDLE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Robson, do you confirm it is correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Robson, other than the government, has anyone else made any kind of promise to you or offered you any inducement to get you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone threatened or coerced you in

1 | any way to get you to plead guilty?

2 MR. YOUNG: No, your Honor.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Does the government represent that if this case were to go to trial, it could through competent evidence prove every essential element of Count One beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, we do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does defense counsel know of any valid defense that would likely prevail at trial or any other reason why his client should not plead guilty?

MR. WEDDLE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Robson, tell me in your own words what it is that you did makes you guilty of this offense.

MR. WEDDLE: With the Court's permission, Mr. Robson has prepared a written version of his allocution. May he read from that?

THE COURT: If I said no, I would be creating a precedent that would cast fear and terror into the hearts of all government and criminal defense counsel from time immemorial. So I guess I'm obliged to say yes, he may read it.

MR. WEDDLE: Thank you, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: I worked at Rabobank on various currencies --

THE COURT: Slow down.

THE DEFENDANT: Sorry. I worked at Rabobank on

2.3

various currencies as a money market dealer from approximately October 1990 through October 2008. From approximately 2004 until I left Rabobank in 2008, I was Rabobank's primary yen LIBOR submitter to the British Bankers Association. I understand that Rabobank yen LIBOR submissions were supposed to accurately reflect the rate at which Rabobank could borrow yen in the London interbank market on a particular day.

Beginning no later than 2006 and continuing until October 2008, working together with others, I tailored the yen LIBOR submissions I made on behalf of Rabobank in order to profit the bank's position.

For example, I received requests from Mr. Thompson,
Mr. Motomura, and Mr. Yagami to make particular submissions or
to move my submissions in a particular direction in order to
benefit their trading positions, and I complied with those
requests. I also conveyed some of these requests to a
submitter at another bank and requested that he match the way
in which I made my submissions, and I in turn reciprocated
these actions with him.

I tailored my submissions in this way at the direction of my supervisor. The way I sent yen submissions was also modeled on the way that others at the bank set the bank's U.S. dollar submissions. When I tailored my submissions in this manner, I understood the parties taking opposing trading positions could be negatively affected, and I knew that some of

2.3

these parties that could be affected were American financial institutions.

Rabobank's submissions were transmitted by wire to Thomson Reuters and were published electronically worldwide. In addition, it was foreseeable to me that payments that were linked to LIBOR were transmitted by wire between financial centers worldwide, including New York.

When I made these submissions designed to favor the bank's trading positions, I knew that it was wrong to do so.

THE COURT: In addition to knowing that it was wrong to do so, you realized, did you not, that your scheme would cause harm to those who were not aware of the way in which the rate was being manipulated, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything else regarding the factual portion of the allocution that the government wishes the Court to inquire about?

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, we would prove that at least one of the financial institutions that was affected was insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

THE COURT: Very good. Anything else?

MR. YOUNG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything else regarding any aspect of the allocution that either counsel wishes the Court to inquire further about before I ask the defendant to formally

enter his plea? Anything else from the government?

2.3

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, this doesn't pertain to the allocution, but the statute also contains a \$100 special assessment.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you for reminding me of that. The penalty also includes a \$100 special assessment. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: That is mandatory. Also, do you understand that because you are not an American citizen, you would face deportation from the United States following any prison time that the Court might impose? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else from the government?

MR. YOUNG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: My courtroom deputy wants me to ask, I think this is correct, the defendant was previously arraigned, yes? Or not? No, he was not previously arraigned.

I think we have covered everything that would have been covered by an arraignment in the allocution, so I don't think anything further is necessary. He has already indicated he has read the indictment. Do you waive the public reading?

Does the defendant waive the public reading?

MR. WEDDLE: Yes, we waive the public reading, your

E8년4동안 1914-cr-00272-JSR Document 21 Filed 09/02/14 Page 15 of 27

1 Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: He obviously is aware of his right to counsel and all of his various rights because we went over that as part of the allocution. So, I think we have covered everything that would be covered in an arraignment. But thank you, I'm glad that was brought to my attention.

Is there anything else along those lines that either counsel wishes to raise?

MR. YOUNG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything from the defense?

MR. WEDDLE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Robson, in light of everything we have now discussed, how do you now plead to Count One of indictment 14 Cr. 272, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because the defendant has acknowledged his guilt as charged, because he has shown that he understands his rights, and because his plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of Count One, I accept his plea and adjudge him guilty of Count One of indictment 14 Cr. 272.

Now, Mr. Robson, the next stage in this process is that you will be given a substantial period of time to assist the government pursuant to your agreement. Then there will

2.3

come a time no later than a date that we are about to set when you will be sentenced. A few months before that date, the probation office will begin preparing what is called a pre-sentence report to assist the Court in determining sentence.

As part of that, you will be interviewed by the probation officer. You can have your counsel present to advise you of your rights, but under my practices if you want to qualify for the full credit of acceptance of responsibility, you personally need answer any and all questions put to you by the probation officer. Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: After that report is in draft form but before it is in final form, you and your counsel and also government counsel will have a chance to review the draft and to offer suggestions, corrections, and additions directly to the probation officer, who will then prepare the report in final to come to me.

Independent of that, counsel for both sides are hereby authorized to submit and file with the Court any motion or other materials bearing on any aspect of sentence provided they are submitted and filed no later than one week before sentence.

I understand the suggestion is to put the sentence down for the same at it as the co-defendant who previously entered a plea. Is that correct?

1 MR. YOUNG: Yes, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: That date, remind me. I know it was right around the corner.

MR. YOUNG: I have June 9, 2017.

THE COURT: Assuming you are still free, we will set it down for June 9th, 2017 at 4 p.m.

MR. YOUNG: My calendar is open that day.

THE COURT: What is the story on bail?

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, we have talked to Mr. Weddle. We would like to propose a joint agreed bond package.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. YOUNG: We would like to propose that Mr. Robson be released to reside back in the United Kingdom on a \$500,000 bond that he is going to secure with \$90,000 in cash. He is permitted to keep his travel documents because he needs to return to the United Kingdom. He would be permitted to travel internationally to the following places if he asks to do that. That would include the United States, France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Greece, turkey, Thailand, Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

THE COURT: And, assuming it is no longer part of the UK, Scotland?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, assuming it is no longer part of the UK, I think Scotland would be agreeable.

THE COURT: My understanding was that he would also be

E8년동안 1914-cr-00272-JSR Document 21 Filed 09/02/14 Page 18 of 27

2.3

required to report weekly by email or some other similar electronic method to the pretrial services department. Yes?

MR. YOUNG: Judge, that is what pretrial is recommending. That wasn't part of the agreement that I had with Mr. Weddle. That is a recommendation of pretrial services.

THE COURT: Any objection to it?

MR. WEDDLE: I just don't see any point for it, your Honor. He is going to be residing in the UK. He has one location, which is his address in the UK. He was born in that town. He lives basically a town over. The town he lives in is basically a town over from where he was born.

THE COURT: It has been known in this cold cruel world for people to change their mind and become fugitives. The sooner one finds that out, the better.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ WEDDLE: I think I agree with your Honor that there are always possibilities.

THE COURT: What is the harm? It's one email a week.

MR. WEDDLE: I just think it is totally unnecessary.

THE COURT: In the normal course someone who in his position would not be released on bail at all or would be detained here in the United States because there is no way to otherwise assure his reappearance. That is made even more a potential problem given the long list of countries that he is permitted to travel to. It is true it doesn't include Monaco

or Lichtenstein, but not too much else is omitted. It doesn't seem to me at all unreasonable that we should be able to have some check on his whereabouts.

MR. WEDDLE: Certainly, your Honor. Let me take a step back. In my view, Mr. Robson would be a great candidate, except for his citizenship, for release on his own recognizance. And even with respect to his citizenship, he has come to the United States voluntarily. He came voluntarily today for this proceeding and he has come in the past voluntarily to meet with the government. He has waived extradition. He has the entire right to process in the UK which he has waived and decided to come here voluntarily for a guilty plea, which is I think one of the most important events.

THE COURT: Of course all of that cuts in his favor.

I wouldn't be considering this package if all of that wasn't

true. He has demonstrated that at present he is going to make

himself available. But we are talking a period of several

years, and things can change. Pressures can be brought.

I'm still having trouble with what you view as the burden. Pretrial services makes two recommendations: 1, to report to pretrial services via weekly Internet check-in. That on a slow day will probably take him 30 seconds; secondly, to notify pretrial services of any travel and provide a detailed itinerary. The government presumably could demand that as part of its cooperation agreement if they wanted to. I'm having

E8년 4년 1년 14-cr-00272-JSR Document 21 Filed 09/02/14 Page 20 of 27

real difficulty seeing what the objection is.

Let me put it to you this way. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MR. WEDDLE: Sorry, your Honor. My thought was the entire package that we put together in our discussions with the government --

THE COURT: Oh, my gosh. Somehow I wasn't invited to this.

MR. WEDDLE: I realize, your Honor. But it was all entirely modeled on the conditions of release of Mr. Yagami, who was before your Honor.

THE COURT: I didn't have this recommendation before me in his case or I might have imposed the same conditions.

MR. WEDDLE: I agree with you, your Honor, this is a very minor point. It is likely quite simple for Mr. Robson to comply with it. But it doesn't seem targeted to the issue that we are dealing with here. Fundamentally, the thing that is going to make him continue to show up is his agreement with the government. Today is a day that is bad for him.

earlier, which is should he -- and I am reasonably confident this will not come to pass, but it has come to pass in some cases in the past -- should he change his mind and become, in effect, a fugitive, it is useful to find that out sooner rather than later. Actually these will be only modest checks in that regard, because he can email from anywhere in the world. But

if he were to fail to email, that would set off alarms. If he were to travel without notification, that would set off alarms.

I hear what you are saying. Let me give you the choice. You don't have to accept that. If you would rather have him withdraw his guilty plea, I'm telling you in advance I'm going to, if he wants to continue with his guilty plea, impose those conditions. But I don't want you to be under any misapprehension. If you want to withdraw the guilty plea in light of that statement of what I'm about to do, feel free.

MR. WEDDLE: Your Honor, not at all. It is obviously not an onerous condition, and it pales in comparison to all the other conditions that he has already agreed to. I just didn't see why it would be imposed on him versus Mr. Yagami. But, as I have said, it is a tiny additional condition.

THE COURT: I appreciate your eloquent arguments, but I am going to impose those two conditions: First, to report to pretrial services via weekly Internet check-in, and, second, to notify pretrial services of any travel and provide a detailed itinerary in advance.

I'm told also that he needs to, right after this session, report momentarily for a urinalysis in the normal course. That will need to be done this afternoon.

With those additions, the bail package is acceptable to the Court.

Where do things stand on the fugitive defendant?

2.3

MR. YOUNG: Your Honor, there are two individuals who have been indicted who have not made their initial appearances yet, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Motomura. We are seeking their extradition.

THE COURT: Where does that stand?

MR. YOUNG: We, the trial team, have submitted to our office of international affairs our paperwork seeking the extradition. With regard to Mr. Motomura, the office of international affairs has been in contact with the Japanese ministry of justice to discuss the package and to make sure it is acceptable to them. With regard to Mr. Thompson, it is my understanding that the package is with the office of international affairs.

THE COURT: Where does he reside?

THE DEFENDANT: He is in Australia, your Honor. Mr. Motomura is in Japan.

THE COURT: Why is this taking so long to get moving?

MR. YOUNG: The office of international affairs tells

me that it is a complicated extradition process, that they have

a large number of fugitives sought from Australia and the

United Kingdom. The same people in the office of international

affairs do both the United Kingdom and Australia.

They tell me that they are looking at our package, but they want to make sure it is as appealing as it could be to the authorities in those countries that need to rule on it before

we send it over. By send it over, I mean officially through diplomatic channels as opposed to previewing it to their justice ministries.

THE COURT: Was this not part of one of the, in economic terms, largest frauds in history?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, it is.

2.3

THE COURT: Would it be reasonable to expect the office of international affairs to give it some priority?

MR. YOUNG: That would be reasonable to expect, Judge.

THE COURT: But it doesn't appear they are. They are telling you take your place in the queue. The office of international affairs is part of the Department of Justice or the Department of State?

MR. YOUNG: Part of the Department of Justice. The Department of State also has a role to play. When the package is done at Justice, it gets transmitted by State.

THE COURT: Bureaucracy is a wonderful thing. I would have thought that someone like Mr. Robson would have a real and genuine interest in moving this process along because his sentence, it could be earlier if anyone requests it, but it is not going to be later than that at it is set. That date is set in stone.

If you tell me, Judge, his cooperation is not completed because the mighty office of international affairs took two years to work out all the niceties of its extradition

2.3

package and so we are only now getting to trial, I'm going to tell you that you were warned in advance and he was warned in advance that the sentence will occur on that date.

MR. YOUNG: I understand, your Honor. I didn't want to leave the impression that we are simply in the queue.

Office of international affairs is telling me that they are reviewing it, they are looking at it and thinking about it.

One event that is important in this time line was the plea of Mr. Yagami, which happened in June.

We wanted to be able to tell the countries from which we seek extradition that we have somebody that is prepared to testify. As a tactical matter, we thought that would make the extradition package more solid. So, part of the delay is a result of the timing of Mr. Yagami's plea.

THE COURT: Unless things have changed, and I doubt they have, the United States Department of Justice has a long history of never seeking the indictment of anyone that it is not convinced can be proved, by proof available to the government, guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Isn't that the policy?

MR. YOUNG: That is the policy, your Honor.

THE COURT: It is nice that you have some cooperators, but you would not have brought the indictment if you didn't think you could prove beyond a reasonable doubt. So I don't understand what concerns these other countries would have

unless they want to ignore 200 years of the best traditions of the United States government.

MR. YOUNG: It was our assessment, Judge, that notwithstanding our practice of never seeking an indictment unless we were sure that we could obtain a conviction, nonetheless the countries that received those packages may view the application as more appealing if we were able to represent that we had a cooperator signed up.

THE COURT: The countries involved are the UK and Japan?

MR. YOUNG: Australia, your Honor.

THE COURT: Australia, I'm sorry, and Japan. They are not exactly countries that are unfamiliar with U.S. policies and practices, right?

MR. YOUNG: They are not unfamiliar, your Honor. Your Honor, I would also like to add, as to the Court's inquiry about the process of the case, there is also a chance that we would seek a superseding indictment in light of information that has come to light from our two cooperators. If that involves other individuals, which is a distinct possibility, the clock would restart from when those individuals are indicted. Just for the Court's information about the process of the case, I wanted to point that out.

THE COURT: That's all fine and good. But at the rate you're going -- it is not you personally, obviously -- at the

rate the office of international affairs or other people are 1 2 going, what it sounds like is you will have a paper indictment 3 that will add even more individuals we will never see in our 4 lifetime. That may be an exaggeration, but maybe not so much 5 an exaggeration. It is well established that the longer it 6 takes to bring a case to trial, the more difficult finding the 7 truth becomes. Witnesses forget things. People disappear. 8 All sorts of things can happen.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

I just do not understand it. If this were a small case, that's one thing. But given the nature of this case and assuming the government's allegations are correct, the need of people throughout the world to see that some justice is done, that that should be delayed because someone in some bureaucratic office is tinkering with making a better package or referring to the many other matters that are on their plate seems to me unpalatable, to say the least.

MR. YOUNG: I can't dispute anything that the Court just said on that score.

THE COURT: Perhaps you will bring those sentiments to the notice of the appropriate authorities.

MR. YOUNG: I'm sure that they will learn about this issue.

THE COURT: Very good. Anything else we need to take up today? I'm signing now the bail package and giving it to my courtroom deputy to distribute appropriately.